FELLOWSHIP

June 1944 Vol. X—No. 6

Vera Brittain Answers the President on the Bombing of Enemy Cities

IN

Not Made in Germany

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE:

The Spiritual Menace of Russian Communism

By A. J. MUSTE

•

Peace Strategy in Latin America

By JOSEPH M. GOODMAN and DEVERE ALLEN

•

News of the FOR on Three Continents

NEVIN SAYRE • MURIEL LESTER • P. C. HSU

15 cents a copy $1.50 a Year

FROM MY STANDPOINT

John Haynes Holmes

Washington, April 28 (AP)—*Burial of an unknown soldier of World War II in an identical tomb in Arlington Memorial Amphitheatre beside the unknown soldier of World War I is proposed in a resolution by Representative Fish* (*R., N. Y.*).

I

THE Citadel of St. Peter and St. Paul in Leningrad is the burial place of the tsars of old Russia. Not all the tsars are buried in this gloomy mausoleum—some of these dead rulers are entombed in the Kremlin in Moscow! But enough are behind those walls across the Neva River to make an impressive showing. Their marble sepulchres of uniform design, grimy with the dirt of time, crowd the vast chamber, row on row, like so many huge chests stowed away in a neglected attic.

It seems as though the Russian people never got rid of one tsar but what there was always another to take his place. They came at intervals of twenty or thirty years through the centuries. Some were sane and some insane; some were strong and some weak, but all were cruel; some were assassinated, and others, *mirabile dictu,* died quietly in their beds. But there was no end to them. At least not until the revolution of 1917, when not only Nicholas II but all his seed were driven from the throne, and the throne itself destroyed! But the tombs of the dead tsars still remain, a monument now to the death not of despots but of a dynasty.

II

I thought of these chest-like royal tombs, which I saw in 1931 (I wonder if the long siege and bombardment of Leningrad has left them intact!), when I read the above newspaper dispatch about the placing of a second tomb in Washington for a second Unknown Soldier. Is this to be the beginning of a succession of tombs which is never to have an end—until some revolution comes along to change the course of human events?

I remember the first Unknown Soldier, and how he was buried in that solemn sepulchre at Arlington Cemetery. There was a contagion of Unknown Soldiers' tombs at that time. I have seen the sacred dead thus honored and enshrined in Westminster Abbey in London, before the Arc de Triomphe in Paris, beneath the Dome on the Unter den Linden in Berlin, before the Victor Emmanuel Monument in Rome, and at a location that I do not recall in Brussels.

All these tombs were dedications not so much of the dead in war as of the living in peace. They were sober resolves, projected in marble and proclaimed in words of bronze inscription, that "these dead shall not have died in vain." In the name of these unrecognizable heroes, who had given "their last full measure of devotion," we, "the living," pledged ourselves to fulfill the purpose of their sacrifice. We would keep peace henceforth upon the earth. This tragic and terrible World War should be the last of all wars among the nations. "The war to end wars!"

Now a quarter of a century has rolled away—and here we are in a second World War, making plans, before this war is done, to find a second Unknown Soldier, and set up a second tomb in his honor beside the first! This opens up a ghastly prospect—a long line of tombs on that noble height at Arlington, cluttering up the place like the royal tombs at St. Peter's and St. Paul's in Leningrad. One tomb after another, row on row again, in apparently endless succession! And the inscriptions on these tombs—World War I, World War II, World War III, just like Alexander I, Alexander II, Alexander III, and the other duly numbered tsars! Is this the kind of exhibition that we are preparing for ourselves, and for our children and our children's children, in that lovely cemetery overlooking the nation's capitol? A dynasty of wars, like a dynasty of kings—and each a sepulchre of shame?

III

With all due respect to Representative Fish, whose spirit is sincere and purpose pure, I venture to suggest that his proposal is a bit precipitate. Let us wait a while—and see!

If this war is another failure, as it threatens to be, and thus ends in new balances of power, old rivalries of diplomacy and trade, armaments, conscription, and military training of the young, then it will be well, it seems to me, to let the second Unknown Soldier sleep in the bloody soil where he fell. To gather up his broken body and bury it in grandeur in the Arlington Amphitheatre will be a profanation of the dead. For this second Unknown Soldier can but memorialize in sorrow the betrayal of the first, and prophesy in horror the dedication of a third, and a fourth. One tomb of this sort is enough in a world still committed to war. Nay, one such tomb is one too many. For the dead whom we would thus honor is only mocked by the parade of our pretentions and the sheer hypocrisy of our homage.

But what if the war ends in an enduring peace? What if year passes into happy year—and "the war drums throb no longer, and the battle-flags are furled?" What if in America, Europe, Asia, Africa, and the islands of the seas, nation no longer lifts up sword against nation, neither learns war any more? It hardly seems possible! But if the dream comes true, then on some bright and distant day may we gather up the sacred dust of a valiant Unknown, and in Geneva, or Jerusalem, or Delhi, or some such capitol of the world, prepare one tomb which shall be a sacred shrine for all mankind. On the day of that universal burial, songs may well be sung and trumpets blown in the presence of representative men and women from all quarters of the globe. For as we lay this second Unknown Soldier in his marble sepulchre on some Mt. Zion, whither "nations shall come to thy light," we may declare, in one great chorus of accord and loud acclaim:

"At last we have not failed. Here is the pledge and token, the sign and seal, that these dead have indeed not died in vain. For peace has come—great peace, everlasting peace. And there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, nor any more pain, for, behold, the former things are passed away."

FELLOWSHIP

Published by the
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE, A. J. MUSTE } *Editors*

R. ALFRED HASSLER
Managing Editor

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Devere Allen
Walter Russell Bowie
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Eugene Exman
Caleb Foote
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Helene Hale
John Haynes Holmes
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Elmore M. McKee
Ferner Nuhn
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Edwin McNeill Poteat
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman

FELLOWSHIP is published monthly. Reentered as second class matter February 15, 1941, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

15 Cents a Copy $1.50 a Year

FELLOWSHIP

THE JOURNAL OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

June 1944 Vol. X—No. 6

The Spiritual Menace of Russian Communism

By A. J. MUSTE

IN the *Saturday Evening Post* of May 13, 1944, appeared an article by Forrest Davis, one of its leading editorial writers. Previous to its publication it had been rumored on high authority that President Roosevelt himself had passed upon this article and assisted materially in the writing of it. For that matter, a reading of the article made it clear that the President would have to repudiate it as a colossal fraud and as gravely and adversely affecting morale, or expect that it would be regarded as an exceptionally frank and authoritative exposition of his thinking and of his actual course in international relations. So regarded, the article is startling and depressing.

Briefly, Mr. Davis describes the President as "an exponent of the realistic great-power theory." Russia has become a great power. Hence Moscow "becomes the focal point of our diplomacy." Even the United States must tread very warily in dealing with Russia. "Whereas Wilson could lead forthrightly from strength, the President's objective . . . calls for finesse, a skillful statecraft that *cannot always be exposed to view.*" (Italics mine.) Under the circumstances, his policy is to "avoid the slightest cause of offense to the Kremlin." Indeed Mr. Davis describes it as following "the Biblical injunction to walk the second mile"!

The ostensible object is of course stated to be that of bringing Russia into "a society of nations," but it is hard to see how such a "society," in view of Mr. Roosevelt's assumptions and theories, can differ from a straight power-politics set-up. For "this war teaches the President that hereafter only countries with an abundance of manpower and resources plus huge industrial plants can engage in the complex business of war. . . . Finland's plight with respect to Russia resembles that of a lone man with a pistol confronted by fifty riflemen." He advises Finland accordingly to "make peace on Russia's terms."

Under the circumstances the President finds it necessary to rebuke "a misconception of the nature of the war being waged by the United States" which is "pressed in the main by citizens who see the struggle as overwhelmingly ideological—solely a war on Fascism. By a curious irony, many of these critics applaud Russia's patriotic war while denying us *the right to advance our national interest in whatever quarter is most advantageous.*" (Italics mine.)

What if the effort by appeasement to get Russia into a "society of nations" fails and she goes on patriotically pursuing her national interests? The reply is frank if startling: "Stripped to the bare essentials, we fought in 1917 and are fighting now to prevent the mastery of Europe by one aggressive power. Should Russia, as the sole European power, display tendencies toward world conquest, *our vital interest would be again called into account*"—that is, World War III would break out.

Obviously this article is of the utmost importance in connection with military and political developments in the coming months and years. We postpone, however, the analysis of these matters until the July issue of *Fellowship* when Mr. Davis' second article will also be available. The article has nevertheless an important bearing upon an even more fundamental question which we are discussing now—namely, why do we hold that the communist philosophy of life and society and the Russian State are in the profoundest sense a menace to the Jewish-Christian and the democratic faith and way of life?

Nature of Communism

Before tackling that question, one or two words of caution must be recorded. For convenience the term Stalinism will occasionally be used in speaking of the communist philosophy-Russian state complex which we are analyzing. This does not imply that I regard Stalin personally as a monster. Unless specifically stated, nothing is implied one way or another as to his private character. As a political figure I regard Stalin as Mr. Roosevelt evidently does, as one who is playing the game of power-politics in the so-called national interest of Russia. Again without reflection on their private character, I regard the national leaders on both sides in the war, who are thus contending for their respective national interests, as politically sinister figures in the profoundest sense. The other word of caution is that the Russian regime is not wholly bad and corrupt. No society of human beings is, because if it were it would fall apart. It is "that of God" in societies as well as individuals which holds them together. In order to combat effectively that which is evil in Stalinism, it is necessary to recognize the positive elements in Russian economic organization, for example, and at other points. And of course the Russian people are not a peculiar, vicious breed any more than any other people. I am convinced that they would respond to proposals for a peace of justice and reconciliation as any

other people would. All this does not alter the fact that we need to understand and inflexibly to contend against the menace represented in the combination of Russian statism and communism or Marxism-Leninism.

Significantly enough, Mr. Roosevelt in the *Saturday Evening Post* article gives more than a hint that he is aware of the extent and nature of this menace. "Back in 1918," according to the President, the task of peacemaking was different and very much simpler because "the concept of the moral and legal unity of the European community, coming down from the Holy Roman Empire and Christendom itself, still was potent. *On it was based international law and the comity of nations generally.*" (Italics mine.) But "the Soviet Union . . . has fallen out with the European traditions" in this spiritual sense and must be brought back into it before there can be in the political sense any "world association" or "assured hope of peace." This is the one point where there is no effort to blunt the edge of difference. Here the President has made a profound observation. Would that his political course were deduced from it rather than from "the realistic great-power theory."

Jewish-Christian prophetism, pacifist Christianity, or religious pacifism (whichever term one wishes to employ here) and communism are both "revolutionary" as over against the existing political and economic order and its spiritual assumptions or professions. But they differ radically both as to the order which they would substitute and the means by which they would achieve their aim. And of course, as always, ends and means are here integrally related.

The End Sought

As to the first, communism, especially in its Marxist-Leninist and Stalinist form, carries to its logical conclusion the process begun under latter-day capitalism and imperialism of reversing the Christian doctrine that "the sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath." In communism man is submerged in the impersonal collective, the monolithic party, and the totalitarian state. The human person who is of infinite worth, eternally precious in the sight of God, is degraded and made a cog in a machine; where "a human being, always individual and never to be repeated, is for Christianity a more primary and deep reality than society."[1]

Recently as I was reflecting on these matters I recalled Nicholas Berdyaev's *The Origin of Russian Communism,* published as far back as 1937. I read again especially its last three chapters and was surprised to find how pertinent to the immediate situation they sound. I cannot do better than to quote some of his penetrating and pregnant formulations. In the communist or Stalinist view, "man is a function of society, a technical function of economics. Society is the phenomenon while man is epiphenomenon . . . In its atheistic, materialistic form communism entirely subordinates man to the time process; a man is only a transient unit in a series of moments and every moment is but the means which produces the next. Thus man loses his interior existence; human life is dehumanized."

Again, "Soviet philosophy is a philosophy of titanism." Note this term. May it not be much more expressive of what we have in mind, as well as less clumsy, than "totalitarianism"? Berdyaev continues: "The titan in it is not the individual but the social whole. . . . Everything is contrived not by enlightenment of thought, not by the light of reason, but by the exaltation of the will, the revolutionary titanic will." Consequently "revolutionary communist ethics are inevitably merciless to the living concrete man, to one's neighbor. The individual man is regarded merely as a brick necessary for the construction of communist society."

Berdyaev in this same work points out the distinction between the Soviet and the Christian or democratic concept of freedom which is more illuminating and valuable than all the disquisitions on "economic vs. political freedom"—freedom in Russia and freedom in America—that we have heard. With us freedom means freedom of choice; consequently there must be civil liberties. In communism freedom means the power to get things done, to manipulate men, to change the world, which you get as a member of the new collective society, once you have surrendered your "freedom" (in the other sense of the term) to it. Freedom in the Soviet sense means "the active changing of the world, as an act accomplished not by individual but by social man, after the choice has been made"—the sole "choice" the individual man makes in the communist scheme of things. Outside Russia, he makes that choice voluntarily when he joins the Communist party and surrenders his freedom to it, whatever its zig-zags. In Russia, he is born into the new collective society.

Berdyaev made an observation based on his profound insight into this problem, which has been verified in recent years and months: "It sometimes looks as though the Soviet government would rather go on to the restoration of capitalism in economic life than to granting freedom of conscience, freedom of political thought, freedom to create a spiritual culture." It is, however, state capitalism, or features of it, which one encounters in Russia.

The Means Used

Space does not permit us to spend much time on the means which communism uses to build the new society, nor is it necessary after what has already been said and in view of what is common knowledge. Marx and Lenin shared with certain modern theologians a profound pessimism about man; but Lenin especially saved himself from social despair because he believed that a new and better order could be externally imposed on men; they could be regimented into communism and once you had your new machine working you could turn out anything you wanted to from it.

Under this system there are no limits other than your idea of what is necessary to produce results, no limits to the violence, terror, torture, discovery, or secret police espionage you may employ. Hatred and the attaching of little value to the individual human life are an integral part of this way of life. D. J. Dallin, in *Russia and Post-War Europe,* just issued by Yale University Press, quotes the Red Army Day slogan: "Let's get even with the German Fascist rats. Blood for blood! Death for death!" And a commander of a guerrilla force writing in *Izvestia:* "For every drop of my children's blood shed by the Fascist cannibals, I have already drawn a bucket of enemy blood . . .

[1] *The Origin of Russian Communism,* by Nicholas Berdyaev. Scribners, 1937.

But that is not enough . . . I will fill the whole River Dvina with black blood—and this, too, will be too little." In such an atmosphere the militarization of youth is being carried in Russia to extreme lengths.

What we face in the world today is the anti-Christian philosophy of life which I have sketched not as a theory held by few or many men but as a titanic force which inspires and in its turn uses the apparatus of the Russian state with the resources of the Russian people at its command. Russian Communists have this additional advantage that in Russia as in no other country in the world an old ruling class has been completely swept away. In government, industry, education, everywhere, a new, fresh group—young also in years—is in control. They are vigorous, determined, uninhibited, unscrupulous. And they have unbounded confidence in themselves and contempt for any who stand in their way. They have never experienced the defeat and disillusionment that comes to every ruling group eventually. In addition to controlling the vast material and human resources of Russia they are free to experiment, unhampered by precedent and by old equipment, which men hesitate to scrap, in building the Russian economy. What we are about to see, unless an effective counter-force is built up, is the potentalities of regimentation and tyranny in a dictatorship based on a materialistic philosophy and with a sense of world-mission, which has the vast enginery of modern technology at its command.

It is this vast and sinister force with which the world is confronted as the war draws to an end and so-called peace-making begins. One does not need to be a "red-baiter" to say that the prospect is terrifying. Indeed, they are unrealistic and blind who do not see that the very existence of Western civilization and the survival of the Jewish-Christian world-view are at stake. To bring this upon ourselves and upon the world we have fought this war.

Hope for the Future

There are two factors which make for modification of the Soviet-Communist regime today and which make its eventual dissolution possible if right measures are used to that end.

In the first place, we have pointed out that what we have in Russia today is a religion with the apparatus of a modern power-state and the resources of modern technology at its command. But this means that the devotees of the religion, the Communist party, must take some account of the sentiments of the citizens or subjects of this state, namely the Russian people. An authoritative and indispensable account of this factor and many other matters of current importance is found in the book by D. J. Dallin already referred to. Of course, Russian nationalism has its impact on the communist scheme of things, and many people cherish a hope of good relations with Russia in the near future because it is becoming "sensible" (i.e. nationalistic and capitalistic). But there is little or nothing here on which to base such hope. "No greater mistake can be made than to see Soviet policy as moderate, conciliatory in spirit and limited to narrow objectives," Dr. Dallin concludes.

More important for the purposes of the present article is the fact that the concept of man on which communism is based is not founded on reality. In the end, men will not be poured into this mould. The effort to do so could only end, if not resisted by a genuinely revolutionary force, in the destruction of mankind.

That other force can only be Jewish-Christian prophetism, pacifist Christianity. "Christianity is again called upon to protect man, to protect his whole image from a demonology which torments him anew, from servitude to the old cosmic and the new technological forces."[2]

It is not an accident by any means, therefore, that in recent months the *Daily Worker,* organ of the Communist party in the United States, in fact if not in name, has devoted considerable space to the Fellowship of Reconciliation. Religious pacifism is fundamentally and radically revolutionary, and therefore the one force which can effectively challenge Russian communism. It recognizes the need of an inner revolution, re-creation of the human being; of a revolution also in the social order so that the will of God may be done on earth; and of a revolution in method by the renunciation of war and all organized violence. Our strength for carrying out our crucial task will come from God and will express itself in love for Communists and all men, and in our fidelity to the positive task of building a brotherly order of life by means consonant with that end.

[2] *Ibid.*

A Modern Parable

And in those days cometh a flaming patriot, preaching in every hamlet, and saying, Restore now the ancient sacrifice, for thy sovereignty is at stake. For this is he whose precursors are revered in every hall of fame, who declare,

> Subject thyself to every will of the state,
> And to its leader who standeth above all.

Now he himself lived in great abundance and splendor, and many came to seek his favor. But when he saw some whose vision was wider than his, he cried, Ye offspring of vipers, who sent you here to challenge the dream I proclaim? Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of a patriot, and think not to say within yourselves that God is all men's Father, for I say unto you that our sovereignty standeth above all.

And it came to pass that as this man traveled to a far country, preaching the doctrine of his nation's greatness, he was apprehended by the authorities as a disturber of the peace, and thrown into a concentration camp.

Now when the patriot heard the distant rumble of guns, and saw flashing through the sky mighty armadas of bombers, yet found himself unrelieved of his internment, he secreted messengers to the great man before whom his nation made obeisance, saying, Art thou fulfilling our expectations, or look we for another?

And the great man raged, crying, Go tell the incarcerated one what ye have seen and heard:

> The seeing go blind,
> The walking limp.
> The healthy are diseased,
> The hearing are made deaf,
> The living are cut down,
> And the poor have destruction preached to them.
> And cursed be he who finds offense in me.

LEE LYNNE

Not Made in Germany

A REPLY TO WILLIAM L. SHIRER AND THE PRESIDENT

By VERA BRITTAIN

Author of "Massacre by Bombing"

AS the author of the *Fellowship* supplement, *Massacre by Bombing,* which was supported by twenty-eight eminent Americans and which led to widespread controversy in the American press through March and April, I have recently received an impressive collection of newspaper clippings. The vehemence of defensive indignation aroused by this modest plea for a return to the standards of international law, clearly indicates the depths of uneasiness to which the mass bombing of German cities has moved the American conscience.

Among my clippings were several copies of a widely syndicated article by William L. Shirer, author of the popular *Berlin Diary,* which I recently read with much admiration for its fairness. This quality was so conspicuously lacking in Mr. Shirer's highly selective attack on my essay, that I can only suppose he was put up to make the most damaging possible case against it and its twenty-eight supporters without regard for the normal journalistic standards of fair play.

In justice to Mr. Shirer it should be stated that he had not before him my actual book, *Seed of Chaos,* from which extracts were taken and retitled by the editors of *Fellowship,* and was not therefore possessed of the total evidence on which my position was based. But as his article clearly suggests that I am either a Nazi dupe or a Nazi propagandist, I trust that the American public will permit me the courtesy of a reply.

There is no reason whatever why Mr. Shirer should take any interest in me or my writings, but when one attacks a person, it is usual to find out something about her first. Had he troubled to do this, he would have discovered that the point of view expressed in *Massacre by Bombing* had been consistently maintained since 1919, and was first wildely circulated in America in a book accepted by the Macmillan Company for publication two months before Hitler came to power. How, in these circumstances, my outlook can be "Nazi-inspired" is a problem capable of solution only by Dr. Dunne, the author of *An Experiment With Time.* In a later book called *England's Hour,* written during the Blitz on England and published in February, 1941, while we were still enduring heavy raids, I urged that we should withstand the impulse to retaliate which has led to the policy of "saturation" bombing, against which the recent protest was directed.

"Where Were You When They Bombed England?"

One anonymous correspondent who sent me the Shirer article from Pittsburgh angrily scribbled on it: "Remember Germany had every intention of bombing England to obliteration. Where were your qualms and protests then???" As one of the bombed, who has been through six hundred raids and come near to being obliterated myself on several occasions, I have perhaps more reason than my correspondent to remember Hitler's policy toward England, and other countries.

Actually, I did protest against it, in a manifesto addressed "To the conscience of the world" by a group of writers belonging to the London P.E.N. Club; but I doubt whether these protests against the crimes of our enemies (always called "squealing" when the Germans make them) really have much moral validity. Neither I nor my fellow British writers are responsible for Hitler's policy, except in the general sense that the evil done by the Nazis—though Mr. Shirer believes it to have been "without the slightest provocation"—followed directly from the blindness and stupidity of Allied policy, including that of the United States, between wars. Neither I nor my fellow writers elected Hitler, but we did help to elect the present British government. Unless I protest against the policy which it is carrying out in my name, I acquiesce and become responsible. And I will not acquiesce in the infliction upon other mothers and children of the horror and fear that my children and I have suffered, doubled and trebled and doubled again.

Our raids here are not yet over, but should I still fall victim to them, my blood will not cry out for vengeance. It is from the seeds of vengeance that the Satanic flower of nazism springs. My Staffordshire compatriot Arnold Bennett once wrote (I quote from memory): "If suffering reaches a certain bitter point, the heart loses its life forever." Thousands of German mothers and children, homeless and dispossessed, living in conditions which Sir Arthur Harris himself has described as "incredible"[1] have reached that point through the action of Mr. Shirer's country and mine. And I maintain that no cause, least of all the noble cause professed by the defenders of democracy, justifies the reduction of human beings, made in the image of God, to the level of beasts.

Throughout his article Mr. Shirer suggests that the material on which my essay was based came wholly or mainly from "German sources." He carefully refrains from mentioning that, with very few exceptions, these sources were first quoted by *British* correspondents of such reputable and well-informed newspapers as *The Times, Daily Telegraph,* and *News-Chronicle.* Although my references to these newspapers were conscientiously reproduced in footnotes by the editors of *Fellowship,* Mr. Shirer no more refers to them than he refers to the British and American politicians, Air Marshals, and RAF pilots and commentators, whom I quote far more extensively than "German sources" and "Swiss correspondents." Or does he suggest that the Air Marshals, RAF commentators, and British correspondents are themselves the victims of "Nazi statistics"?

[1] Basil Cardew, *Daily Express* Air Reporter, Jan 3, 1944.

Authenticity of Figures

One particular figure which Mr. Shirer suggests that I "swallow . . . without the slightest suspicion" is the *News-Chronicle* quotation of the figure of 1,200,086 given by the German Government Statistics Office in Berlin as that of German air-raid casualties up to October 1, 1943. Neither the *News-Chronicle* nor, so far as I am aware, any other British newspaper suggested that this figure was fantastic or even slightly exaggerated; but Mr. Shirer persuades himself that it is because another statement, issued by the German Ministry of Home Security, and also quoted by the *News-Chronicle,* gives "only" 102,486 persons killed in the RAF raids on twelve German towns in the seven months from April 1 to October 25, 1943. Mr. Shirer tells us that "actually more British bombs were dropped on these cities in this period than on all the rest of Germany from the beginning of the war to October 25," though he does not give his authority for this statement, and the twelve towns did not include Berlin, Essen, Bremen, Magdeburg, Munich, Leipzig, Brunswick, Lübeck or Rostock.

If Mr. Shirer had lived for four years, as I have, in one of the world's most bombed cities, he would know that official estimates of casualties in individual towns or districts are usually understatements, for the horror likely to be aroused in other countries by large-scale civilian deaths is offset by the lowered morale caused by heavy casualty lists in the bombed areas themselves.

If we choose Hamburg as an example, various estimates of casualties quoted in my book range from 47,000 to 200,000; and Hilary St. George Saunders, author of *The Battle of Britain,* wrote in the *Sunday Graphic* for August 29, 1943, that "the figure of 50,000 dead may well be a conservative estimate." The German Ministry of Home Security put this figure down to 28,350. Taking into consideration the tendency to official understatement, and the fact that, according to Air Commodore Howard Williams, "half of Germany's principal cities have already been heavily bombed," I did not and do not regard the *News-Chronicle* figure of total casualties as in any way improbable. Since it did not include the series of heavy raids on Berlin which began in November, 1943, or the many "saturation" raids on other cities which have occurred since October 1 last, I would say instead that by now this figure certainly has been greatly increased.

Who Began the Bombing?

Having established me, to his own satisfaction, as the dupe of "Nazi statistics," Mr. Shirer takes me to task for "bitterness" against Air Marshal Harris. "It was not Harris," he writes, "who invented the Strategy of Terror, but Hitler. Harris—Miss Brittain and her friends ought to know—is merely answering it, answering fire with fire since nothing else will do." Let us therefore examine this matter more closely.

At the Disarmament Conference of 1932, Italy proposed the abolition of the bombing airplane, and was supported by Germany, Russia, and the United States under President Hoover. That humanitarian proposal ultimately was shipwrecked by the British government through its representatives Lord Londonderry and Sir John Simon, who, in the words of Hugh Dalton, now President of the Board of Trade, "from the beginning . . . resisted and obstructed."

Why did they resist and obstruct? Because Britain wanted to retain the bombing airplane for use against native tribes on the Northwest frontier of India. And according to *Time*—usually a very well-informed magazine—the person responsible for "developing" this "pacification by bombing" policy which "kept unruly Indian tribes more or less under control," was none other than Sir Arthur Harris, the present head of Bomber Command.[2]

In view of these facts, even Mr. Shirer can hardly acquit Britain of responsibility for the continued existence of the weapon with which Hitler bombed Warsaw, Rotterdam, and Belgrade!

Further light on Mr. Shirer's contention that we—i.e. the British and Americans—"did not start the bombing of great cities" recently has been thrown by the publication of *Bombing Vindicated*[3] by J. M. Spaight, former Principal Assistant Secretary of the Air Ministry. In this book Mr. Spaight, who presumably knows what he is talking about, not only makes the surprising statement that Britain began the "strategic" bombing of Germany before Germany bombed Britain, but also suggests that the British should be proud of having done so. He writes: "Because we were doubtful about the psychological effect of propagandist distortion of the truth that it was we who started the strategic bombing offensive, we have shrunk from giving our great decision of May, 1940, the publicity which it deserved. That, surely, was a mistake. It was a splendid decision. It was as heroic, as self-sacrificing, as Russia's decision to adopt her policy of 'scorched earth.' It gave Coventry and Birmingham, Sheffield and Southampton, the right to look Kiev and Kharkov, Stalingrad and Sebastapol, in the face. Our Soviet allies would have been less critical of our inactivity in 1942 if they had understood what we had done."

Can Mr. Shirer still maintain that Germany, and Germany alone, began the process which at long last has led to that crime against humanity known as "saturation bombing"?

Justifying Obliteration Raids

He next proceeds, somewhat curiously, to quote a number of pre-Nazi German generals in support of the alleged Harris view that mass bombing is "humane" because it will "shorten the war." "Has the lady author, whose sense of history does not appear to be noteworthy, never read Hindenburg?" he inquires, and goes on to quote Hindenburg's dictum that "the more pitilessly war is waged, the more is it fundamentally humane, for it will come to an end so much the quicker."

I can assure Mr. Shirer that when, in my student days, I studied International Relations as my special subject in the Oxford Honour School of Modern History, I read not only Hindenburg, Clausewitz and Harden, but also von Moltke and von Treitschke, and the *Testament Politique* of Frederick the Great of Prussia, from whom the whole "Reason of State" doctrine has emanated in Germany. I have quoted these German militarists frequently during the past twenty years, but, unlike Mr. Shirer, I have used them as illustrations of a point of view *against* which all our spiritual forces should be arrayed. If we have to quote German generals in order to justify our own adoption of Nazi standards, what becomes of the ideals for which the democracies decided to fight? Are not Mr. Shirer's quota-

[2] *Time,* July 7, 1943.
[3] Published by Geoffrey Bles, 1944.

tions the best justification that twenty-eight Americans and myself could have for the belief that the once constructive standards of our countries have given place to others in which the "seed of chaos" is flourishing?

If "strategic bombing" ever was genuinely and sincerely a device for shortening the war, it has already failed in its purpose. This type of bombing began when Sir Arthur Harris became the head of Bomber Command on March 3, 1942—two and a quarter years ago. Two and a quarter years of total war is not a *short* period, particularly for the bombed. The only argument with which the apologists for bombing now attempt to justify their long-drawn-out infliction of agony upon huge populations, is the old Teutonic argument—against which the whole progress of international law has been directed—that any method of warfare is justified so long as it succeeds in defeating the enemy.

In conclusion Mr. Shirer argues that the only alternative to fighting Hitler with bombs is "slavery to the Nazis." This is not the case. One alternative to fighting Hitler with bombs is fighting him with intelligence; with constructive political proposals, the lack of which the Bishop of Chichester recently lamented in his House of Lords protest against mass bombing. If the United Nations sincerely desired to shorten the war, they would long ago have abandoned the obtuse demand for unconditional surrender and offered the German people some better incentive for abandoning Hitler than the dismemberment of their country and prolonged occupation by Allied troops. Offered no prospect better than this, the German people have no alternative to putting up with Hitler and enduring mass raids, which increase their resistance just as their smaller onslaught on us in Britain increased ours.

It was by the use of intelligence that President Wilson shortened the last war, through publishing one of the most enlightened documents ever issued to a world in conflict. It is not too late for his successor to take the same road, and pursue it to another and better conclusion.

Reply to the President

I had not completed the draft of my reply to William L. Shirer, when the *News-Chronicle* of April 27 reported President Roosevelt's "stinging rebuke" to the twenty-eight Americans who signed the manifesto against mass bombing. As a British citizen I am not called upon to accept this rebuke, and of that I am personally glad, for I have the pleasantest memory of the President and Mrs. Roosevelt's gracious reception of me at the White House in 1937. But I would not accept it if I were an American citizen, for it seems to me irrelevant, unjustified, and destructive of the very ideals with which the American people went to war.

The President says that it is a misstatement to describe the bombings as revenge. It was not, however, our purpose to decry mass-bombing only or mainly for this reason; our intention was to protest against the use of these inhuman expedients as a means to any end whatsoever, and not least to point to the process of moral deterioration in which those who use them become involved.

But it is, unhappily, all too easy to quote the most authoritative pronouncements in support of the view that feelings of revenge cannot be excluded. On July 15, 1941, for instance, Mr. Churchill stated at the County Hall in London: "We will mete out to the Germans the measure, and more than the measure, that they have meted out to us." When, later, he said at Washington with reference to the Japanese conquests: "All this has to be retrieved, and all this and much else has to be repaid," and again promised that Japanese cities would be laid in ashes, the *Times* correspondent reported of Congress that ordinary applause was insufficient, and "members shouted their approval." It seems as though a spirit of vengeance possessed Congress, even though the President himself remained free of it.

Again, speaking at High Wycombe on May 31, 1943, Sir Arthur Harris said: "We could remember Warsaw, Belgrade and Rotterdam. We could also remember how the cities of London, Coventry, Exeter, Canterbury and other places were bombed. We should not forget. These were to us disasters, but they were disasters that we were repaying and which we should continue to repay." Many other similar quotations could be found from the speeches of political leaders.

In the second place, the President uses the argument, with which I have dealt in my reply to Mr. Shirer, that "bombing is shortening the war in the opinion of an overwhelming percentage of military authorities." It is, however, well known that most military authorities possess expert minds which are necessarily limited to their own sphere. With rare exceptions, they are apt to perceive only one aspect of the present and little of the future, and their judgments tend to be based on mathematical calculations rather than on human reactions.

But the President's final challenge—that "you can be pro-German and pro-Japanese and look forward to new 'dark ages,' attended by world-wide death and destruction or a continuance of the philosophy of peace and the maintenance of civilization. You cannot effect a compromise between these two views"—seems to me by far the most disquieting aspect of his rebuke, for this challenge is none other than the challenge of nazism itself. "Either support the State," it says, "and endorse the wars made by the State to whatever lengths the military experts want to carry them; or count yourself as the State's opponent." But, as Felix Morley has pointed out in *Human Events*[4], democratic civilization was once defined by Winston Churchill as "a society based upon the opinions of civilians," Mr. Morley reminds us that our Western civilization, of which the United States is rapidly becoming the dominant part, has been built since the time of Plato upon the freely expressed opinions of civilians, among whom those who challenge the majority have a vital part to play. "Without this freedom of expression, the democracy which we cherish could never have developed, and will not be maintained."

If the State is indeed all, and those who criticize its policy must be ranked with its enemies, for what are we fighting the Nazis? Could we not merely have adopted their doctrines, without the trouble and expense of going to war? Is it not to demonstrate their belief in a higher Authority than that of the State, that thousands of American and British boys are offering their lives?

I submit that there are other ways of fighting totalitarianism—the doctrine of "Reason of State"—than the military way. With all respect, I maintain that the twenty-eight who protested against massacre bombing are helping to preserve the highest traditions of that Western civilization which the President entered the war to defend.

[4] Issue No. 7, March 16, 1944.

Peace Strategy in Latin America*

By JOSEPH M. GOODMAN and DEVERE ALLEN

DIRECT EDUCATION in peaceful methods certainly has its place in Latin America, as we shall later indicate. But it takes only half an eye to see that peace propaganda in its narrowest aspect can find no fulcrum for lifting the heavy weight of violent custom which rests upon the masses. It might even be argued that the establishment of widespread nature education, sounder penology, popular translation of animal lore, and numerous other forms of social training not usually considered relevant to peace education might do more good than anything else. Above all, the vast economic distress which gnaws ceaselessly at the emotional life of so many Latin Americans, and for which outsiders are historically largely at fault, must be supplanted by economic justice, wider distribution of wealth, and the development of potential resources into greater prosperity.

Not apparently connected with the question of peace education, but tending to create conditions which need to be cured, are two other causes of violence. One of these is the common view of sex, the other bad health.

It is strange that those who write about Latin America are uniformly silent about the sex life of the region. To discuss it with any profundity would require specialists in social psychology, which the present writers are not. But it is everywhere obvious that sex habits are directly productive of the violent upheavals that so frequently take place in group and family life. Just as too many inhibitions and repressions bring a train of maladjustments—a point of view of which the northern countries have heard so much in recent years—it is equally clear that too much freedom from inhibitions, as in Latin America, produces its own unhappy outcomes.

No matter how far the Anglo-Saxon world departs from its professions of monogamy in marriage, no matter how hypocritical it often is, that still remains the conventional pattern. But among a considerable minority in Latin America the pattern is that of the double or even the triple family. The effort of a poor man to maintain different homes, either openly or in secret, imposes financial burdens which of themselves lay on him still greater burdens of nervous strain and irritation.

Upon the impoverished male whose philanderings enchain him in an ever-more-complicated web of responsibilities, upon the mother who sees her children unprotected by a father whose interests have gone with the wind, upon growing boys and girls who have witnessed cynical disregard for their well-being, rests a dire emotional stress. If the facts could be ascertained, as of course they frequently cannot, they would back up the sociologists in Latin America who contend that a major cause of attempted homicides is the typical sexual double standard.

Well people are likely to be poised people, while ill people are rarely too ill to indulge in the violent outbreaks urged on by physical strain. And Latin Americans by the millions are not well. There is frequent irritation when too much is said about this unquestionable fact, but chiefly because outside commentators, however sympathetic, fail to appreciate the wonderful advances of public health work in the face of heart-breaking tasks. But go to the ranches and ask a mother how many children she has. She may have six or seven, but later you are likely to find that she has lost as many. Malaria, hookworm, and dysentery take a frightful toll, and make their victims unable to resist the more serious diseases.

In New York the average yearly death rate per thousand persons is about 9.8; in Santiago, Chile, it is 24.8, in Lima it is 20.5; in Carácas it is 19.4. Colombia has a lower death rate from tuberculosis than the U.S.A., the ratios being 46.6 and 47.2; but Mexico's is 55.4, Guatemala's 64.3, Costa Rica's 83.9, Argentina's 103, Panama's 210 and Brazil's 250.

If such widespread ill health does not erupt into violence directly, it joins with history, religion, and other factors to produce a peculiar attitude toward death. Though Anglo-Saxons face death bravely, they do not take it to their bosoms. For many Latin Americans, however, especially the 55,000,000 of Indian blood, life is not particularly sacred; and death often is, though chiefly from the point of view of private sorrow and public form. The Cuban, who, by the way, has no Indian blood, will scrimp and save and defy all sorts of human needs that his Anglo-Saxon brother takes for granted, and yet die happy if he knows he is going to have an impressive monument in that class-ridden display of opulence known as Havana's Colón Cemetery. This ready acceptance of death leads to a lack of consideration for the lives of others.

Cultural Differences

We have failed in the purpose of this discussion if we have not shown, by concrete illustration, that profound psychological differences exist between the friendliest of southern and northern neighbors. In short, there is absolutely no basis for the glib generalization sometimes heard, to the effect that all human beings are just the same under the skin. Peace education simply cannot start with the assumption that what is acceptable or even intelligible on one side will suffice on the other. Dr. Edmundo O'Gorman, who knows both sides well, has found evidences of a mutual resentment that is four hundred years old. He believes it can be dispelled, but less by mere preachments and the spread of good-will propaganda as such, than by the education of each side in sympathetic understanding.

In their literature may be found clues to the conflict exhibited in the approach of Latin Americans to the outer world, a phenomenon not exclusive to it, of course, but one compounded of unique elements. That approach has long been a mixture of idealistic cooperativeness and nationalistic suspicion toward other countries. Colonial Latin America, except for Brazil, was dominated by Spain in architecture, painting, music, and literature during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. From then

* Last of a series of three articles on Latin America.

on, however, the stream of French writing took hold, and left a deep impression on Latin American thought. European influence seemed to characterize the whole rule of Porfirio Diaz. The late nineteenth century produced such important writers as Amado Nervo and Rubén Darío, who were inspired by a universal outlook. Both had lived in France and were much affected by the schools of poetry there in vogue. But from 1920 on, Hispanic America witnessed the rise of authors deeply interested in their own part of the world. Mariano Azuela writes of the Mexican revolution. José Rivera deals with the Colombian jungle and the rubber plantations. Romulo Gallegos paints the life of Venezuelans. There was a complete change. America became the theme.

Yet eyes and ears were still turned toward Europe, and while the United States was provincial, Latin America practically hung on European culture and events. It may be hoped that this duality of interest may yet constructively serve the future, by fomenting a robust inter-Americanism, yet one which is by no means isolationist or unconcerned about the world as a whole. Tracts for peace, however, cannot be superimposed successfully on this literary experience unless those who write them know the artistic and literary soul of the Latin Americans who are to read them. And their outlook is emphatically not that of New York, Los Angeles, or Omaha.

Future Strategy

It must be the wisdom of future peace educators to discover how the quick and responsive idealism that is one of Latin America's most engaging traits can be brought to bear on objectives of social concord. Facile writing, preaching, organizing, and North American rally tactics will make absolutely no headway. Said the brilliant Argentine, Julio Navarro Monzó, who was inspired by Quaker contacts twenty years ago, "The man who must save Latin America will have to be a saint and not an intellectual." That statement requires some modification, perhaps, for there is no immutable law that prevents intellectuals from being saintly. And in our modern chaotic world it is totalitarians who burn books, while saintliness scarcely thrives on ignorance. But Navarro Monzó's point is sound. His is a striking implication: that no merely ideological approach, no simple propaganda, can be useful unless accompanied by friendly action.

It is the conviction of many Washington officials that nothing can be done for international friendship in Latin America save directly through the Catholic Church. Not a few Protestants seem to feel that their organizations, equally, provide the only effective channel for social progress. But many of the most advanced and peace-minded liberals in the twenty Latin American republics are free-thinkers, paying no particular respect to religion of any kind. Certainly this delicate question, which so few people frankly discuss—thereby adding to the obscurantism which already is bad enough—needs to be boldly faced.

It cannot be denied that Catholicism in the Latin American lands has been, and is, below the standards of progressiveness which most Catholics uphold as necessary in the United States. The church has often been political as much as religious, and its political trend has often been reactionary. But it is extremely important and is by no means seriously losing its support, even where it has suffered legal reverses, or where its religionists are moved as much by folklore or primitive paganism as by Christian tenets. What many people in the United States have thus far failed to realize is that within the framework of Catholicism itself, even in Latin America, there is now developing an appreciation of the hold which radical social ideas have on the masses, and of the great role labor is yet to play all the way to the southernmost reaches of the continent. The truth seems to be that some of the church fathers are making a sincere effort to fit themselves into the pattern of life they have come to see will prevail.

Wise peace workers, comprehending all phases of Catholic activity in the neighbor republic, will encourage peace-minded Catholics to take into Latin America their own fervor, among them the various units of Pax which have been so advanced in Britain and the U.S.A. Those who want to work through the Protestant churches will find plenty of problems there, and a great need for peace education. But it would be practically fatal if U.S. peace workers attempted to go into Latin America and, starting from centers of Protestant activity alone, sought to organize and expand.

Catholicity with a small "c" is perhaps the soundest way of all, emphasizing credos less by words than by honest, friendly action which by its universality dissolves antagonisms and allows ideas to be considered on their merits. Partisanship, narrowness of any kind, will in the long run be self-defeating. Generosity, sincerity, high-mindedness, a patience that sees past the skepticism with which the sincerest efforts will often be received—these will go farther than the neatest formulas.

Quakers and workers from several other religious and social groups have done a great deal in Mexico to batter down, by means of their desire to be of simple usefulness, the ancient prejudices. They have been wise in seeking projects which involve sacrificial labor of hands, undertakings that speak a message that the most unsophisticated peasant can be brought to understand.

There is demanded a prose of fellowship and, too, a poetry. The Latin American will inevitably formulate his aspirations in the singing phrase. Constancio G. Vigil, the Argentine publicist and poet, set the keynote of common work when he wrote:

O America, keep fresh your love! Yours will be the hand
On which the world will rest its forehead seared by fire!
Care for your orchard! The sweetness of its fruits will assuage victors and vanquished.
Guard the purity of your springs! From them will come the goblet of water for thirsting mankind. . . .
Praised be the peace under whose protection are won the battles against hunger and ignorance, and under which endlessly increase the ranks of the armies of God.

Latin America needs its International Houses; its sympathetic, independent press-reporting of events; its fact-finding organizations in the field of international affairs; its democratic forums; its enterprising peace centers; its advocates of uncompromising non-cooperation with militarism and reaction. There is an abundance of native leadership, but it must be set free from fears and misconceptions, just as we can only be set free, by fellowship across frontiers.

News from the Peace Front

Reports from Three Continents Indicate FOR Progress

Nevin Sayre Tells Of Mexican Trip

On April 21 Nevin Sayre, secretary of International FOR and co-secretary of our National FOR, returned from a six-weeks field trip, approximately half of which was spent in Mexico. Excerpts from his report give the highlights of his Mexican visit.

"This was the first visit which I had made to a Latin American country since my FOR trip to Central America in 1929 when Nicaragua was occupied by United States marines. There is no doubt that the Good Neighbor policy, whatever its limitations, has marked a great change for the better since those days. I had an hour's talk about general conditions with the United States Ambassador to Mexico, Mr. George Messersmith. He thinks that Mexico will not again see any such revolution as occurred in 1911, that the country is set toward inevitable industrialization, and that the conflict between state and church is in process of being reasonably adjusted. The wage earners and peasants are feeling the pinch of rising war prices and shortage of food. The United States ought to help in this situation as much as it possibly can and we are doing considerable. The relations between the two governments are excellent. Mexico is fulfilling her engagements scrupulously.

"I was kept busy almost every day, except when traveling, with speaking engagements and interviews growing out of a schedule which had been arranged by Senor Roman Torres, executive secretary of the *Concilio National Evangelico de Mexico.* Professor Heberto Sein (leader of the Quakers in Mexico City), Gustavo Velasco, secretary of the *Alianza Juvenil Evangelica Mexicana,* Miss Margarita Wright (teacher and FOR member in Guadalajara), and Francisco Estrello (Quaker) of Monterrey cooperated effectively. They threw open the doors for presentation of my message to their respective groups and never missed on having a good translator at each meeting where I spoke. There were 20 such meetings with an estimated attendance of 935 persons. Mexico City, Guadalajara, Monterrey, and the Quaker work camp at Tetecala were on the schedule. I also visited Cuernavaca for two days of conference and fellowship with Devere Allen.

"Near the end of my visit a crystallization of pacifist sentiment took shape in the formation of a committee which hopes to organize a Mexican FOR. Its chairman is Gustavo Velasco and it includes besides some young people such well tested pacifists as Professor Heberto Sein and Professor Jose Brocca from Spain whom Allan Hunter wrote about in 'White Corpuscles in Europe' and who went through two years in a concentration camp in France before emigration to Mexico.

"Projects on the Committee's agenda are: (1) organization of intimate peace cells; (2) discovery of pacifist individuals, especially in cities not yet represented on the Committee, intervisitation between pacifists of different cities; (3) perhaps the holding of a Mexican FOR conference in the fall or next year; and (4) translation and publication of three or four pacifist pamphlets such as Allan Hunter's *Heroes of Good Will* or Alfred Hassler's *The Next Peace.*

"Besides the fact that anything like religious pacifism is almost a new idea in Mexico, the outstanding weakness of our position is that we have no Roman Catholic assistance for the planning and development of pacifist work in a predominantly Roman Catholic country. Nor have we the proper approach to the masses of Mexican peasants. I am, however, fully satisfied that Latin America offers a field for pacifism that the FOR should not delay in cultivating."

Muriel Lester Writes from London

A letter from Muriel Lester, dated March 18 in London, was received in New York on May 15. Space permits our quoting only a few passages:

"I've spent a good deal of time this winter trying to get architects and folk who will be wanting to put up memorial windows to realize what a superb opportunity is ours in England for getting work done for us by the leading stained glass window artist of the Continent, Eugene Yoors, as he and Magda Yoors, who leads the FOR in Belgium, escaped from Dunkirk and have been here ever since. We are hoping to have one of his windows in our new FOR premises. The British FOR had a legacy from Elsie Ghosh and with part of it we've acquired a big house in Gordon Square, close to Friends' House, Euston Road. Its one of those gracious, roomy old houses. We of the International FOR occupy the second floor. The London Union has the third floor. In the basement is the chapel and refectory. On the ground floor and first floor are committee rooms, the office of the general secretary of the FOR and the rest of the staff.

"I am spending a lot of time on India, in committees, at conferences, in political work, and in writing to those in authority. Also we never forget for more than a few hours the ghastly burden of the hunger of our close neighbors in Belgium and France, and in Asia. The grim facts would be unbearable but for constant recourse to prayer.

"I spent six weeks around Christmas on my book. It is two-thirds finished. [Miss Lester then listed dozens of speaking engagements she had filled during the past six weeks.] I am going up to Scotland next month to speak at a series of their monthly gatherings of ministers and laymen in Edinburgh, Glasgow and Perth. Denominational barriers seem to be withering in many districts. You've heard about the future of Coventry Cathedral, where all sorts of Christians are expected to have their communion together. When a High Anglican priest asks a Presbyterian pastor to help him distribute the bread and wine in an early Celebration, one *has* to take notice. We're not as far as Holland yet where, Magda Yoors tells me, the Protestants and Catholics happily share a church together.

In a postscript Miss Lester said, "Buried one of our loveliest boys from Kingsley Hall this week, killed fire-fighting. The recent blitzes are foul."

Far Eastern FOR Office Is Urged

A meeting of FOR members in Chengtu, China, last December, considered plans for establishing a Far Eastern Office of the International FOR. Ten persons attended the meeting, called by P. C. Hsu, who only a month later was killed in an automobile accident. The group, which is perhaps the only FOR group in China that has continued to function through the war, was heartily in favor of opening such an office, for the purpose of promoting friendly relations and peace education. Calcutta was their first choice as to location, if there is to be only one, but they favored the establishment of another in Chungking if at all possible.

Andy Roy is chairman of the Chengtu group, and Mrs. Norman Glass secretary. The report of their meeting was received in New York on May 4. They "felt strongly that we should take steps immediately toward our goal."

FOR Field Secretaries

South: Constance Rumbough, 1804 Grand Avenue, Nashville 4, Tenn.; *Midwest:* Emerson Schwenk, 740 Rush Street, Chicago 11, Ill.; *Northwest:* Mary Farquharson, 4033 University Way, Seattle, Wash.; *Northern California:* Caleb Foote, 2151 Vine Street, Berkeley 7, Cal.; *Southwest:* Glenn Smiley, 1837 N. Berendo Street, Los Angeles 27, Cal.; *Rocky Mountain:* Margaret Rohrer, 440 East 13th Avenue, Denver 3, Colo.; *Rural:* Warren Nelson, Prairie du Sac, Wis.; *Refugee:* Marion Frenyear, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.; *Action Projects:* George Houser, 7100 Kinsman Rd., Cleveland, Ohio.

The News in Brief

House Committee Plans Militarization

Prospects for a peaceful and democratic post-war world were further dimmed with the creation of a "Select Committee on Post-War Military Policy" in the House of Representatives on March 29.

An Associated Press story the next day declared that the make-up of the 23-man committee "made it almost certain that the group ultimately would recommend retention of a formidable peacetime army, navy, and air force, built up probably through compulsory military training." Many of the members have expressed themselves as favoring such a policy, and the chairman, Clifton A. Woodrum (D., Va.), "warned against repeating the 'blunder' of dismantling the Army and junking part of the Navy after this war."

This obviously foreshadows a concerted effort to saddle some form of compulsory universal military training on post-war America, for that is the only possible way in which the avowed purpose of the committee could be accomplished.

FOR Secretaries Going to Prison

The heavy hand of the government rested on the shoulder of the National FOR as this issue of *Fellowship* went to press. Four of its secretaries were expecting to receive prison sentences almost any day for refusing to cooperate with the process of conscription.

The four men facing prison terms are Glenn Smiley, Southwest secretary in Los Angeles, Calif., Caleb Foote, Northern California secretary in Berkeley, Calif., Roger Axford, until recently Midwest secretary in Chicago, Ill., and R. Alfred Hassler, managing editor of *Fellowship* and co-secretary of the Literature Department in New York. Detailed facts about their cases will be carried in these columns next month.

Emerson Schwenk Is New Midwest Secretary

The Rev. Emerson Schwenk, former minister of the First Universalist Church, Bridgeport, Connecticut, has been appointed Midwest secretary in charge of the Chicago office of the FOR. He fills the vacancy left by the arrest of Roger Axford.

Mr. Schwenk has maintained his pacifist witness firmly during the war, and resigned from his pulpit a short time ago in protest against the hanging of a service flag in the sanctuary of the church. The incident was given first-page space in New York newspapers and since that time Mr. Schwenk has received more than 200 letters—all but 10 of them approving his stand—from Protestants and Catholics, Italians and Jews, and even from gold star mothers and service men.

Dates of the Southern FOR work camps given in the May issue of *Fellowship* have been changed. The Nashville camp will be held from July 24 to August 6, and the Clinton camp during the month of July.

* * *

Intensive seminars on Decentralization and Normal Living, under the direction of Ralph Borsodi, will be held in or near Oberlin, Ohio, June 26 to July 1. Members of the sponsoring committee are: Dr. L. Stidley, Oberlin School of Theology; Rev. Wm. Stewart, North Bloomfield, Ohio; and Mildred Jensen Loomis, Lane's End Homestead, Brookville, Ohio. The study will consider ten basic ideologies for the good life and a new world order, and methods of implementation. Write any member of the committee for information.

* * *

In criticizing the 28 signers of the foreword to Vera Brittain's "Massacre by Bombing," Richard M. Steiner, Unitarian minister in Portland, Oregon, made the following interesting admission:

" . . . what these clergymen want is that we should continue to play the game according to the old rules, but war has ceased to be a game. Men are beginning to see it for what it is, the collective destruction of culture and decency and honor."

* * *

The chimes of St. Paul's Cathedral in Buffalo, N. Y., will ring out with the tune of "Onward, Christian Soldiers" when news of the invasion of Europe reaches the city, according to a recent announcement.

* * *

The Catholic-controlled St. Louis University recently became the first collegiate institution in Missouri to admit Negroes. Five colored students have been enrolled for the summer session.

* * *

Churchill's declaration that the Atlantic Charter does not apply to Germany was not received with much enthusiasm in England. Seventy members of the House of Commons presented a resolution asserting that such statements as Mr. Churchill's "have brought the charter into disrepute; depressed the spirit of considerable sections of the Allied populations; stiffened the support of the peoples of enemy countries behind their leaders; and are calculated thereby to prolong the war and make our prospects of permanent peace difficult if not impossible."

* * *

Walter White, secretary of the NAACP, after returning from an extensive trip abroad, recently declared in a nation-wide radio talk that racial friction between white and colored American troops overseas is still hurting the war effort, though considerable improvement has been accomplished by General Eisenhower.

White declared that "a highly aggressive and vocal minority has sought to transplant patterns of racial behavior like that of the most backward states of the South to the countries where they have been sent as soldiers to fight a war against Nazi racial theories."

He also said that many of our allies are puzzled by the American pattern of segregation in the armed forces. "Repeatedly I was asked why the United States should send abroad two armies—one white and one Negro."

* * *

The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, under the leadership of M. J. Coldwell, a member of the Canadian Parliament, is sponsoring a democratic program for a cooperative economy. At present this party claims the support of 30 per cent of the Canadian people, and is recognized as the Chief Opposition Party in four provinces.

* * *

Elsa Maxwell, *New York Post* columnist, recently declared that all the "platitudes and paradoxes" of post-war planning will accomplish nothing "until we realize that in this country we have four distinct forces at work—each at war with the other three." The forces she mentions are big business, little business, organized labor, and the administration. "Somehow or other," she says, "the post-war America will have to bring this quadrilateral of forces into equilibrium."

But she went on to confide that her "personal feeling is that this war, like the last, will be followed by a period of great boom and great emotional relaxation. And in this bonanza period of 'permanent' prosperity, as Mr. Hoover labelled the last, all these conflicts will be put aside, the way duellists put aside their rapiers after the signal hour. Of course this gay party won't last. We'll have another '29 in the fifties."

* * *

"The church must assert itself in politics, industry, and commerce, because these realms of life are so seriously interfering in the church's task of evangelizing men and women," states the report of the Social Service Committee of the Anglican Synod of Montreal Diocese, in Canada. "It is an outstanding and pressing duty of the church to convince its members of the necessity of instituting nothing less than a fundamental change in the spirit and working of our economic life." The report also condemned "the use of the word 'Christian' in hotel and other advertisements as a screen for pagan, commercialized anti-Semitism."

The Peacemaker's Bookshelf

Pacifism Under Fire

The Historic Church and Modern Pacifism. By Umphrey Lee. New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1943. 249 pp. $2.00.

The Historic Church and Modern Pacifism is designed to set at rest the scruples of Christian soldiers who may be beset by the belief that participation in warfare is incompatible with the teaching of the New Testament and the practice of the early Church. They are assured that the Church never was pacifist, not even in the age of the martyrs. A subsidiary purpose of the book comes to light only in the last chapter—to repudiate "modern pacifism," defined as the attitude of social gospellers who, disillusioned by the failure of the last war to attain its avowed objective, turned to non-violence as a technique for achieving political ends. They repudiated only violence, not coercion, and recognized the legitimacy of the police power within the state, but failed to see that war may be a necessary stage in the establishment of a similar framework of law and justice on a world scale. Their position is at variance not only with the main stream of the Christian tradition but even with historic pacifism, which has accorded to the police power of the state only a passive recognition and has always tended to withdraw from political life to more or less monastic communities. The book thus pursues a threefold procedure, seeking to discredit at once the validity, utility, and historicity of pacifism. In so brief a review only a few points can be discussed. For a fuller treatment of some other questions see my review of Heering, *The Fall of Christianity,* in the *Christian Century* for May 3.

One of the most controversial of Lee's assertions is that the Church never was pacifist. One may readily concede that the Church never was pacifist without qualification, but to make no distinction between the pre- and the post-Constantinian eras belies the facts. The non-pacifist historian, Adolf Harnack, whose judgment Lee highly respects, affirmed that the age of Constantine saw a complete reversal of the previous *theoretical* pacifism of the early Church. No Christian author whose works are extant condoned, and many condemned, Christian participation in warfare. At the same time there were Christians in the army, especially in the third century, and they were not expelled from the Church. The distinction drawn, however, by Harnack between theoretical and practical is not altogether satisfactory, for it might imply that the same individuals condemned war in words and compromised in deeds. The distinction is rather between persons. The Church early developed a cleavage between an elite coterie from whom were enlisted the martyrs, the bishops, and the writers on the one hand, and on the other the body of the less stalwart who fraternized with the heathen, lapsed under persecution, and participated in war. How many there were who actually served in the armies defies computation. But at least we have recorded the reproach of the pagan Celsus who, writing about A.D. 170 asserted that no Christian would serve in the army. "If all were to do as you Christians," he said, "there would be nothing to prevent the king being left in utter solitude and desertion, and the affairs of the earth would fall into the hands of the wildest and most lawless barbarians." How fairly Lee deals with this evidence may be judged from the following sentence. He says, "Whether there were in the second century those who held that a Christian could not serve in the legions we do not know; but Celsus, the opponent of Christianity, who wrote about the end of the second century, seems to imply that there were."

Another and more important distinction has been hitherto overlooked. It is very significant for the antecedents of the differentiation between police work and war. The early Church noted a difference between military service in peace time and in war time. The reason was that the Roman Empire had no separate police force. Both military and police functions were assigned to soldiers, and in the long periods of peace within the confines of the Empire the soldiers were employed in maintaining order and in putting out fires. Such a situation illumines the baffling injunction of the *Canons of Hippolytus* that "a soldier of the civil authority must be taught not to kill men and to refuse to do so if he is commanded." But how, the modern historian has inquired, could a man be a soldier and not kill? The answer is that he might be a policeman or a fire-fighter. That such a distinction was made appears from the words of Tertullian who asked, "How will a Christian take part in war, nay, how will he serve even in peace?" He disapproved of both, but the point is that he made the distinction. Again, Clement of Alexandria advised, "If you are converted while sailing, follow the heavenly pilot; if while serving in the army, the righteous general." This injunction conflicts with the many condemnations of war in Clement unless it be understood to mean that the Christian may remain in the army but must set bounds to his compliance with military orders. Incontestable is the example of Martin of Tours in the post-Constantinian period, who, on conversion, remained in the army until an actual battle was imminent and only then refused longer to serve. This distinction alone makes sense of the decree of the Council of Arles which so puzzled Harnack that he was disposed to question its authenticity. The Council enjoined that a Christian might not throw down his arms in time of peace (*in pace*). The usual interpretation has been that if he could not throw down his arms in time of peace, how much less could he do so in time of war. The meaning is, rather, that henceforth the door is closed to withdrawal from the army in peace time but is still left open for refusal in war. The Christian might not reject his arms *in pace;* he might do so *in bello.*

The conjunction of the police and the military in the Roman Empire served, however, to render plausible the analogy between war and policing on which was reared the whole theory of the Just War as elaborated by St. Augustine and espoused by the main bodies of Christians to this day. At the same time, the challenge to the validity of this analogy is by no means the invention of modern pacifism. Apart from the examples already noted in the early Church, there is Quakerism, which from the very outset made the distinction. Quakers at first, while rejecting war, accepted capital punishment. They have never held aloof from the life of the state nor immured themselves in more or less monastic communities. They have found themselves not infrequently, as at the present moment, in very ambiguous situations. But their main concern is not to preserve their holiness, but to sponsor in the political sphere discrimination in the choice of means. Anyone who wishes to understand pacifism as a whole, and modern pacifism in particular, should not dismiss Quakerism after George Fox as lying outside the scope of the inquiry. And there is no excuse for neglecting the great work of Margaret Hirst, *The Quakers in Peace and War,* New York: George H. Doran Company (1923).

As to whether utilitarian pacifism has any validity and any antecedents, more precise distinctions must precede any discussion. No Christian pacifism is merely utilitarian. Objection to war is based upon an absolute—the belief that war violates the will of God and the very structure of the universe. But there are differences of expectation as to the immediate consequences of the failure to have recourse to war. Some, who may more appropriately be called utilitarians, have contended that non-resistance would always and immediately disarm the aggressor. Such naïveté did not commence with "modern pacifism" but had its notable exponent a century ago in Adin Ballou. A more moderate and defensible variety holds that while he who turns the other cheek may indeed be hit, yet in the long run a demeanor marked by patient suffering, non-violent resistance, and constant active, constructive effort in every permissible area will in time overcome that which is contrary to itself. This, of course, is not a demon-

stration, but a faith. It does have historical antecedents, and that in the very period of the early Church. Origen defended the refusal of the Christians to participate in war not on the ground that the kingdom of God is not of this world, but on the ground that Christians were already the cement of society and the winsome spirit of Jesus the Word would continue in its course of incredible conquest until all men should become subject to its sway. This too may be regarded as naive, but at any rate it is not merely modern.

A comparatively minor point may be mentioned for the light which it throws upon the method of inquiry in this book. Erasmus is relegated to a footnote with this comment: "Erasmus (1466-1536) was one of the most outspoken opponents of war. I have not quoted him here, not because his words are not worth repeating, but because he represented only himself." Truly this is an amazing statement to make with regard to one who was perhaps the most influential man of his generation. Witness the huge volume by Marcel Bataillon devoted to the influence of Erasmus in Spain alone. To be sure, not all of his followers espoused his pacifism, but again we cannot appraise the influence of his pacifism without first defining its character. He was a Catholic pacifist who admitted the possibility of the Just War but contended merely that all the wars then going on in Europe failed to meet the conditions. In particular he recoiled from the crusading ideal of a war fought under the auspices of the Church and entailing clerical participation. On this particular point Martin Luther followed him. In the general critique of European wars, St. Thomas More was a disciple. A very extensive party carried the pacifism of Erasmus well-nigh to an absolute. They arose in Zurich in Erasmian circles and were called Anabaptists. The author would know more about the nature of their principles were he to consult the pamphlet by John Horsch, *The Principles of Non-Resistance As Held by the Mennonite Church,* Scottdale, Pennsylvania: Mennonite Publishing House (1927). The statement that the chief source for the pacifism of Erasmus is the *Adagia* overlooks the much more significant *Complaint of Peace* reprinted in London in 1917.

ROLAND H. BAINTON

Plan for Peace

"A Working Peace System." By David Mitrany. The Royal Institute of International Affairs, Oxford University Press; 56 pp.; 45c.

In this little pamphlet David Mitrany presents "an argument for the functional development of international organization" which Professor Underhill describes in the December issue of *The Canadian Forum* as "the best contribution to the discussion of peace aims since the war began."

Mitrany's thesis is that the most hopeful approach to the problem of international organization is to get as many international agencies as possible working now, without waiting to set up an over-all constitutional framework first. Pointing out that nationalism is at present too strong to be attacked directly, he emphasizes that by building up a network of international services, national sovereignty will be gradually modified and the states will become accustomed to cooperation.

This approach will sidestep the ticklish question of national sovereignty. Instead of a formal surrender of authority, states would transfer executive authority for specific ends. By laying the emphasis on services rather than on rights, it will be possible to solve problems on the technical level of efficient action. It will also be possible to build up an international civil service with a practical and detached attitude toward international problems.

This method also offers a way out of the dilemma of representation which has been baffling our international theorists. In a central League, if all countries have equal representation, the small states could outvote the big ones, while if representation is in proportion to population, the small states would have no adequate voice. This can be avoided in setting up agencies for different functions by letting each nation's share be determined by its national performance in the field concerned. Thus most countries will have a chance to take the lead in one activity or another: Norway in shipping, Canada in the regulation of nickel, etc.

The past twenty-five years have taught us the futility of concentrating on drawing equitable boundaries. It seems definitely more constructive to lay the emphasis not on changing frontiers but on action across them by building up a network of interlocking international agencies organized according to their natural unit, whether world-wide, continental, or regional.

The argument for functional organization does not preclude the eventual establishment of a universal federation. Indeed, it may well be the shortest way to reach such a goal because the functional organizations would lay the basis for a rounded political system which could grow up organically rather than being artificially created at one fell swoop.

In most discussions of the post-war world too much emphasis has been laid on ways of keeping the peace, which is in itself a negative problem. In the international field, as in the national, the chief function of government should be to perform services rather than to police society. Only by establishing active methods of cooperation may we hope to build up a "working peace" rather than a "protected peace."

EDITH F. FOWKE

(Reprinted from *Reconciliation*)

Spiritual Refreshment

Inward Light, Number 19, Spring 1944, containing sequence of 26 sonnets by Kenneth Boulding.

I have often reflected with gratitude on that operation of Divine Providence by which we are frequently led to the books or the persons we happen to need at a certain time. On a recent Saturday evening I had this experience. It was one of those occasions following much travel and incessant work when the body is only a little tired but the spirit longs for refreshment—partly, by the way, because it has had experiences of unusual joy which also call heavily upon inner resources.

A dear friend had called my attention to the issue of *Inward Light,* "a more or less quarterly publication," to use its own words, "for the exchange of experiences and insights gained from the exploration of the inner life, sponsored by groups of experimenters within and around the periphery of the Society of Friends," which contains the Kenneth Boulding sonnet sequence. (Subscription $1.00 per year; single copies 25 cents, from Irene Pickard, Editor, 1839 Ontario Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.)

The sequence takes phrase by phrase the deathbed statement of the early Quaker saint, James Nayler, which begins "There is a spirit which I feel that delights to do no evil . . .," and to which for nearly thirty years now I have turned repeatedly to find its treasures inexhaustible. If some one had asked me whether any one today could possibly write a poetic comment, or prose either, on this Statement that would not seem an impertinence, not to mention a comment that would actually deserve to stand beside the original, I should have questioned seriously whether it could be done except perhaps by one or two people like W. H. Auden. Speaking soberly, I believe that Kenneth Boulding has done it and has put all those who are interested in the culture of the Inner Life deeply in his debt. Do not delay securing your copy. Space permits me only a brief quotation from Sonnet IV:

> How to endure, when all around us die,
> Nations and gracious cities, homes and men,
> And the sweet earth is made a filthy den
> Beneath whose roof black, belching vultures fly.
>
> Must we be hard as stone? It wears to dust.
> As stiff as oaks? But they untimely break.
> As pitiless as steel? It turns to rust,
> And Time from Pyramids will ruins make.
> In violence, decay, starvation, need,
> What can endure? Only the living Seed.

A. J. MUSTE

Pro and Con

A PAGE OF COMMENT BY READERS

Readers are invited to contribute to this page. Please keep letters brief, since space is severely limited.

Children and the War

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

It is becoming increasingly difficult to help children consider ways other than war for overcoming so-called evildoers. However, many parents and adult leaders of children are today guiding the thinking and living of children in such a way that the children are accepting the philosophy of non-violence or creative good-will as the Christian way of meeting evil. Many of those children are being freed from racial prejudices; they are finding ways other than the buying of war bonds to serve humanity; and they are discovering that being Christian implies a love for man that goes beyond one's own family, racial, or national group.

We know from reports that these things are happening to children, but we need case reports of ways in which the thinking and acting has been guided.

The Children's Committee of the FOR is eager to secure reports of such case studies. Through the pages of *Fellowship* we would ask parents and leaders of children to send us the story of detailed conversations with children through which they have been guided into a fuller understanding of the pacifist position; or reports of projects and activities of individual children or family groups which have helped the child to live the implications of the pacifist philosophy.

Hatred against the enemy is being burned into the hearts and lives of children, but so also is understanding, love, and forgiveness. How is the latter being done? Please ask your readers to write the Children's Committee.

BERNICE A. BUEHLER
Member of Committee

About the Atrocities

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

To R. Alfred Hassler's excellent article in the March issue analyzing the administration's blast regarding Japanese behavior at Bataan, I would like to add a few historical items.

May 22 was the 42nd anniversary of Senator George F. Hoar's exposure in "An Attempt to Subjugate a People Striving for Freedom" of our methods in subjugating the Filipinos. He said:

"Gentlemen tell us that the Filipinos are savages, that they inflicted torture, that they have dishonored our dead and outraged the living. That very likely may be true. Spain said the same thing of the Cubans. We made the same charges against our own countrymen in the disturbed days after the war . . . But who ever heard before . . . that the Republic should act as savages because she had savages to deal with?"

Then he reports the testimony of our brutal methods in putting down the Philippine Republic under Aguinaldo. He said:

"What we are talking about is the torture committed in the presence of numerous witnesses for the purpose of extorting information, and orders from high authority to depopulate whole districts, and to slay all inhabitants, including all boys over 10 years old . . .the secretary of the province of Batanges declared that one-third of the 300,000 of the population of that province have died within two years—100,000 men and women . . . one-sixth of the natives of Luzon have either been killed or have died of the dengue fever in the last two years . . . one-sixth is 500,000 . . ."

Senator Hoar then quotes a general who said:

"The loss of life by killing has been very great, but I think not one man has been slain except where his death served the legitimate purposes of war. It has been necessary to adopt what in other countries would probably be thought harsh measures, for the Filipino is tricky and crafty and has to be fought in his own way."

Perhaps in publicizing the Bataan stories the administration is getting ready to justify a brutal liquidation of Japanese as in 1900 it justified such liquidation of the rebellious Filipinos. We recall that Congressman Hill of Colorado placed into the Congressional Record a transcript of Lothrop Stoddard's radio address demanding that the United Nations execute 500,000 Japanese. Doing so would be in line with our best traditions in subjugating the Philippines!

AUSTIN J. APP

To Methodist COs

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

I am a veteran of World War I, disillusioned by that experience. My eldest son is an officer in the navy, my next eldest is serving thirty months in prison for refusal to register. I believe I have a right to speak to the Methodist CO's.

There is talk that the CO's will protest the recent action of the General Conference on war by withdrawing from the church. It is good to protest, but I believe it a mistake to withdraw, and for the following reasons:

1. Though the action is disappointing, and of the reed-shaken-with-the-wind variety, Methodism will soon regret this action and change it. This is a certainty.

2. Protest by withdrawal will thin down the strong ranks of the pacifist group in the church. Our church is so strong in numbers that our witness within will be much greater in power than any witness without. Methodism is really pacifist at heart.

3. We should not give lawyer Parlin the satisfaction that the Methodist church is rid of our witness. We are celestial gadflies, called of God to sting the Methodist church into vital and wakeful action. Personally, I have deliberately chosen to stay here in the most militaristic section of America. God needs every Methodist CO in our church.

4. While the about-face is tragic, a review of facts and figures is not discouraging. Take a look:

(a) The committee recommended retaining the 1940 stand of the church on war 57 to 17.

(b) The ministers of the general conference favored the recent action by a majority of only ONE! These men are your friends and will need your help in the future.

(c) The total vote was 373 to 300, not a large majority when you consider the pressure of these times.

(d) The strongest and most influential ministers in Methodism spoke and voted for the original stand of the church.

(e) The chaplains present deplored the reversal. (See *Time* magazine, May 15, page 42.)

5. The men in uniform will come back disillusioned by thousands, and they will need our witness and cooperation in the future. We must not desert them. (See *Time* magazine, May 15, page 2, a letter by one F. J. Bourscheidt.)

For these reasons and more, I thnk it would be tragic for CO's to withdraw from the church. I propose to stick. I beg you ALL to stay with us. We shall need the support of every CO in prison, CPS and everywhere. Your day of usefulness in the Methodist Church is certain to come.

R. C. GRIFFITH

Before Pearl Harbor

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

Please take note that in the *Saturday Evening Post* for February 26, there is an article by Joe Alex Morris, "The Nazis Get Licked in Greenland," the story of how we destroyed from the air a German meteorological station. In the second paragraph the author states that this act of violence took place in *September, 1941, three months before* Pearl Harbor. The forces destroying these men when we had not declared war against Germany were the Coast Guard Cutter Northland, and some Flying Fortresses. What plainer proof could there be that Americans were actively in the war a long time before Pearl Harbor? What would we not have said about German treachery and duplicity had the situation been reversed and a meteorological expedition of ours been wiped on in that way? On March 7 the President decorated the commander of the Northland for this piratical exploit, Capt. C. C. Von Paulsen, awarding him the Legion of Merit. I also have official confirmation of this killing from the Director of Public Relations of the Navy Department.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

Because of the paper shortage

"Massacre by Bombing"

by Vera Brittain

is out of print. However, we can still fill orders for the reprint of

"Slaughter of the Innocent"

by R. Alfred Hassler

(about the obliteration bombing)

2c each; $1 per 100; $7.50 per 1,000

Also available

Additional copies of May Fellowship

"American COs in World War II"

15c each; 10 copies $1; 100 copies $7.50

Literature Dep't
2929 Broadway
New York 25, N. Y.

Starving People Need Food Now!

The average Frenchman has lost 33 pounds since the occupation
Children of occupied countries are losing weight—not gaining

You Can't Reconstruct Starved and Dying People!

How would you feel toward a nation that claims your allegiance as a friend but for no good reason starves you and your children by a blockade? The only decent thing to do is to send them food NOW! Tomorrow may be too late!

THE FOOD IS READY!—plenty in South America, Africa, Canada, and U. S.
THE SHIPS ARE READY!—neutral ships that are not available for war shipping.
THE MONEY IS READY!—frozen funds of the occupied countries.
THE INTERNATIONAL RED CROSS IS READY!—to distribute food safely.
MANY ENGLISH PEOPLE WANT IT DONE!—religious groups, press, parliament.
THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT IT DONE!—Gallup poll shows 3 to 1 in favor.
CONGRESS UNANIMOUSLY URGES IT!—both houses.
A PLAN HAS BEEN WORKING FOR TWO YEARS!—in Greece.

Will You Help to Save Europe's Children from Death?

THEN DO THIS WITHOUT FAIL on JUNE 15

1. **Go to your grocery store. (Take some money with you!)**
2. **Buy three 12 to 15 ounce packages of food. Raisins, dried milk, eggs, or fruit; or other high-protein or vitamin A and D foods.**
3. **Go to the Post Office and get *necessary* customs tags for overseas parcels.**
4. **Take it all home.**
5. **Wrap each package securely, placing inside a label saying:**
   For: Europe's Starving Children, From: (You and your address)
6. **Address Package No. 1 to:**
   RT. HON. WINSTON CHURCHILL
   10 DOWNING STREET,
   LONDON, ENGLAND
   Mark it "Unsolicited Gift"
   Postage 14c per lb. or fraction

   Address Package No. 2 to:
   EXCELLENCY VISCOUNT HALIFAX
   BRITISH AMBASSADOR
   WASHINGTON, D. C.
   Regular domestic postage rates

   Address Package No. 3 to:
   THE PRESIDENT
   THE WHITE HOUSE,
   WASHINGTON, D. C.
   Regular domestic postage rates
7. **Follow each package with a note urging action to get food to Europe.**
8. **Repeat the whole procedure every four weeks.**
9. **Get all your friends, enemies, and relatives to do likewise!**

Sometimes an idea starts spontaneously, catches the imagination of people, and grows swiftly to a surprising effectiveness. That is what seems to be happening with the idea represented on this page. It started, so far as we know, in the CPS camp at Coshocton, Ohio, then spread to Pittsburgh, and is rapidly capturing the imagination of all who feel the need of positive action to break down official refusal to ship food to Europe's starving children. If it appeals to you, you will recognize the possibilities of mimeographing or printing many copies of this message for widespread distribution, and of enlisting church and other groups in this "Food for the Starving" project. Incidentally, the plan is *not* invalidated by the impending invasion; Red Cross ships carrying supplies for war prisoners will continue to sail, and so can food ships. The Federal Council of Churches is urging churches throughout the nation to set aside Sunday, June 11 for special observances in the cause of Europe's starving children.